

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application after this amendment. Claims 1-12 are independent. New claim 13 is presented for consideration by the Examiner. No new matter has been added by the addition of new claim 13. Based on the remarks made herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sato (USP 5,453,758); rejected claims 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hashimoto (USP 5,554,980); rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Gillick (USP 5,530,455); rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Okamoto (USP 5,502,461); and rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Hashimoto. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 2 and 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102 – Sato

The Examiner now relies on the teachings of Sato to teach the elements recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Examiner asserts in the outstanding Official Action on page 3, that Sato discloses as follows:

... the display apparatus (24) for presentation characterized by provision of means (7) for determining a menu item (col. 4, lines 48-53) to which the selection marker (cursor K) should be moved (determining the menu item of playback) in accordance with the duration of sampling the angular velocities (Fig. 2) during which the move distance (up or down) of the pointing device (1) obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously (when the pointing device 1 exceeds a predetermined value of Vc continuously in the third sampling cycle, which is located between Vc and Vd, the cursor is moved in a direction) ...

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Sato.

The disclosure of Sato is directed to an input apparatus for outputting as operator information the position specifying information obtained by detecting input apparatus' physical displacement, movement velocity or acceleration to generate a predetermined command signal corresponding to movements of a human being (Abstract).

With regard to Fig. 2, Sato discloses in col. 3, lines 52-62 as follows:

Also, the controller 5 reads an Up command or a Down command from from the ROM 5b or RAM 5c depending on the digital data of voltage E coming from the A-D converter 4 and supplies the command to the transmitter 8. The angular velocity ω applied to the oscillation gyroscope 1 and the generated voltage E are in a proportional relationship as shown in FIG. 2. Consequently, the controller 5 compares the input voltage E (digital data) with voltage values Va, Vb, Vc, and Vd for example, allowing an output of a command code which corresponds to an operation performed on the remote commander 10 by the operator.

As can be seen from the above disclosure, in Fig. 2, the relationship between angular velocity and voltage output in the angular velocity sensor is depicted. The angular velocity and the generated voltage E are in proportional relationship. Consequently, the controller 5 can determine and output a command code based on the voltage value. The command code corresponds to an operation performed on the remote commander 10 by the operator.

In contrast, claim 1 requires the selection marker moving directly to a menu item when the **number of cycles** of sampling the angular velocities **during which the move distance of the pointing device** obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information **exceeds a predetermined value continuously**. The voltage E and the angular velocity depicted in Fig. 2 are not directed to move distance of the pointing device, as required by the claim.

The Examiner notes in the rejection "...in accordance with the duration of sampling the angular velocities (Fig. 2) during which the move distance (up or down)..." However, Applicants maintain that Up/Down disclosed in Sato teaches the direction in which the commander is moved, not the **move distance** as claimed, nor the number of cycles as claimed.

Even assuming the Examiner's interpretation of Up/Down command teaching move distance, the values Va, Vb, Vc and Vd are used to determine whether an Up/Down command has been made. Applicants maintain these teachings are insufficient to teach or suggest moving when the **number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device** obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information **exceeds a predetermined value continuously.**

For at least this reason, Applicants maintain that the teachings of Sato are insufficient to anticipate claim 1. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6 additionally recites "means for moving the cursor or pointer by a distance in accordance with the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously." For the reasons noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicants maintain that Sato fails to disclose moving the cursor in accordance with the number of cycles during which the move distance for every cycle exceeds a predetermined value continuously.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102 – Hashimoto

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 8, the Examiner asserts that Hashimoto discloses all of the claim elements, including a change amount determining means referring primarily on Fig. 45B and its related discussion in col. 28, line 56 through col. 29, line 14. The Examiner indicates on page 19 of the Official Action that he is interpreting the term "sampling" to mean "a technique of selecting an appropriate sample." The Examiner further asserts that the cycles can be appropriate samples. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of this reference.

The disclosure of Hashimoto is directed to a remote control system. The remote control system includes a remote control unit and a controlled unit. The remote control unit is moved in space, and includes a movement detector, selection switch and transmitter. The movement detector detects movement of the remote control unit. The transmitter transmits output of the movement detector and the selection switch. The controlled unit includes a display device, receiver, and controller. The display device includes a display screen, and displays a cursor and icons on the display screen. The receiver receives the output of the movement detector and the selection switch transmitted by the transmitter. The controller moves the cursor across the display screen in accordance with the output of the movement detector and the selection switch. (Abstract)

At col. 28, line 56 through col. 29, line 14, Hashimoto discloses as follows:

FIG. 45A and FIG. 45B show Embodiment 19 of the present invention. FIG. 45A is a block diagram showing the remote control unit according to this Embodiment 19, wherein reference numerals 68 and 68a designate switching circuits that are switched to the Low position from the instant that the selection switch 9 is connected until the elapse of time t due to the action of the delay circuit 67. FIG. 45B shows the operation of a device according to this Embodiment 19, wherein M38 designates the distance through which the cursor 108 moves when the delay time t of the delay circuit 67 is equal to t_1+t_2 .

The following is a description of the operation. As shown by M38 in FIG. 45B, if the switching circuit 68 is provided, the cursor 108 moves up to Y1 for the time t_1 but does not move from t_1 to t_2 . The distance through which the cursor 108 must move is less than the distance along M through which the cursor would move if the switching circuit 68 were not provided. The result is that the effect of pressing the selection switch 9 on the position of the cursor 108 is reduced.

Further, if the delay time t_1+t_2 shown in the Embodiment 18 is replaced with t_1 and an arrangement is made to effect delay time from t_1 to t_2 in this Embodiment 19, it is possible to reduce the degradation in the response due to delaying the output of the angular speed detectors 2 and 3.

The Examiner interprets Hashimoto to teach cycles between 0 and t_1 , t_1 and t_1+t_2 and between t_1+t_2 to t .

In contrast, claim 8 requires a change amount determining means for **determining the amount of change** of said object to change on the display screen, based on the number of cycles of sampling during which the move distance between said indicated positions per unit time, sampled by the move information sampling means, exceeds a threshold continuously. The Examiner asserts the term “sampling” means “a technique of selecting an appropriate sample.” The Examiner further asserts that the cycles can be appropriate sample. However, this definition is contrary to the claim language. Claim 8 clearly requires determining an amount of change based on the number of cycles of sampling, not the appropriate sample to be selected, as interpreted by the Examiner.

Applicants maintain there is no disclosure in Hashimoto that is directed to a number of cycles of sampling. Further, there is no disclosure that is directed to a number of cycles of sampling during which the move distance exceeds a threshold continuously. For at least these reasons, Applicants maintain that claim 8 is not anticipated by Hashimoto.

Applicants submit that claims 9-12 recite determining information based on the number of cycles of sampling during which the move distance between the indicated positions per unit of time exceeds a threshold continuously. For the reasons noted above with regard to claim 8, Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest these elements and thus, these claims are not anticipated by Hashimoto. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner rejected claim 3 based on the teachings of Hashimoto and Gillick. However, claim 3 recites elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 8. As noted above, Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest these claim elements. As Gillick fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Hashimoto, claim 3 is patentable over the references as cited.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 based on the teachings of Hashimoto and Okamoto. However, claim 4 recites moving or enlarging the sub-screen by a distance in accordance with the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device

obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously, wherein the distance moving or enlarging the sub-screen over an interval of time increases while the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously.

As noted above, Hashimoto fails to teach or suggest performing an operation in accordance with the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously. As Okamoto fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Hashimoto, claim 4 is patentable over the references as cited.

The Examiner rejected claim 7 based on the teachings of Sato and Hashimoto. However, claim 7 recites the display apparatus for presentation including provision of means for changing the rate at which the pointer moves in accordance with the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously. As noted above, Sato fails to teach or suggest performing an operation in accordance with the number of cycles of sampling the angular velocities during which the move distance of the pointing device obtained for every sampling cycle from said angular velocity information exceeds a predetermined value continuously. As Hashimoto fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of Sato, claim 7 is patentable over the references as cited.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisin Reg. No.

Application No. 10/522,747
Amendment dated March 31, 2009
Reply to Office Action of

Docket No.: 1254-0267PUS1

52,327 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 31, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Catherine M. Voisin
Registration No.: 52,327
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicants